

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,866,359 to Pan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,322,194 to Silverbrook. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As argued during the personal interview, neither of the applied references teaches or suggests a detector that determines if the mechanical module is in a static condition or a dynamic condition, when the power supply device supplies the drive power to the drive source while changing the drive power, as recited in independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

The Final Rejection acknowledges that Pan does not disclose this feature. However, the Final Rejection asserts that Silverbrook remedies Pan's deficiencies. These assertions are respectfully traversed.

Silverbrook merely discloses a microprocessor 41 that is employed to detect a predetermined level of movement of an actuator arm 27 (i.e., the "calibration level") within a predetermined time window that falls within the calibration time, as shown in Fig. 17 (Silverbrook, col. 5, lines 34-40). However, the actuator arm of Silverbrook requires pivoting at successively increasing degrees for a period of time before it reaches the calibration level (Silverbrook, col. 5, lines 26-33). Therefore, the microprocessor 41 of Silverbrook merely determines the level of the dynamic condition of the actuator arm at a predetermined time. Thus, the microprocessor 41 of Silverbrook does not determine if the mechanical module is in a static or dynamic condition when the power supply device supplies the drive power, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable over Pan and Silverbrook. Further, claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 15, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over Pan and Silverbrook for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. For example, as argued during the personal interview, Silverbrook does not disclose wherein operation conditions associated with the static

condition and the dynamic condition of the mechanical module determined by the detector are temporarily stored in a storage medium, as recited in claim 15 (emphasis added). Silverbrook merely discloses correlating the predetermined level of movement of an actuator arm (i.e., the "calibration level") within a predetermined time window that falls within the calibration time with the particular pulse duration that induces the requirement movement within the time window (Silverbrook, col. 5, lines 34-40). Accordingly, Silverbrook only correlates a particular level of the dynamic condition of the actuator arm with a particular time. Thus, Silverbrook does not disclose temporarily storing the operation conditions associated with the static condition and the dynamic condition in a storage medium.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/mcp

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: March 17, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--